and in the Statesimplied pledge to take the subject under consideration, and orders the petition to be blaced among the public records for safe

But to proceed, in reply to the objections of our opponents. It is next urged that precedents are against the side we support. meet this objection with a direct denial From the beginning of the Government to the commencement of this Session, there is not a single precedent that justifies the receiving of these petitions, on the ground on which their reception is urged. The real state of the case is, that we are not following, but making precedentts. For the first time has the principle been assumed, that we have no discretion, but must take jurisdiction over them, however abfrivolous, mischievous, or foreign from the purpose for which the Government was created. Receive these petitions, and you will create a precedent which will hereafter establish this monstrous principle. As yet there are none. The case relied on by the Scuator from Tennessee (Mr. Grundy) is in no respect analogous. No question in that case, was made on the reception of the petition. The petition slipped in without king a vote, as is daily done, where the attention of the Senate is not particularly called to the subject. The question on which the discussion took place was on the reference, and not on the reception, as in this case: but what is decisive against the precedent, and which I regret the Senator (Mr. Grundy) did not state, so that it might accompany his remarks, is the fact that the petition was not for abolishing sla-The subject was the African slavetrade; and the petition simply proyed that Congress would inquire whether they might not adopt some measure of interdiction, prior to 1808, when by the Constitution. they would be authorized to suppress that trade. I ask the Secretary to read the prayer of the petition:

But we find it indispensably incumbent on us, as a religious body, assuredly believing that both the true temporal interests of nations, and eternal well-being of individuals, depend on doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly before God, the creator, preserver, and benefactor of men, thus to attempt to excite your attention to the affecting subject, [slave trade;] earnestly desiring that the infinite Father of spirits so enrich our minds with his love and truth, and so influence your understanding by that pure wisdom which is full of mercy and good fruits, as that a sincere and an impartial inquiry may take place, whether not an essential part of the duty of your exalted station to exert upright endeavers, to the full extent of your power, to remove every obstruction to public righteousness, which the influence or artifice of particular persons, governed by the narrow, mistaken views of self-interest, has occamistaken views of self-interest, has occamistated views occamistated views of self-interest, has occamistated views of self-interest, has occamistated views occamis sioned; and whether, notwithstanding such seeming impediments, it be not really within your power to exercise justice and mercy, which, if adhered to, we cannot doubt abolition must produce the abolition of the slave-trade.'

Now, I ask the Senator where is the analogy between this and the present petition, the reception of which he so strengousty He is a lawyer of long experience and of distinguished reputation; and Lput the question to him, on what possible prin ciple can a case so pefectly dissimilar, justily the vote he intends to give on the present occasion? On what possible ground can the vote of Mr. Madison to refer that petition, on which he has so much relied, justify him in receiving this? Does he not perceive, in his own example, the dauger of forming precedents! If he may call to his uid the authority of Mr. Madison, in a case so dissimilar, to justify the reception of this petition, and thereby extend the inrisdic-tion of Congress over the question of emancipation, to what purpose hereafter may not the example of his course on the present occasion be perverted?

It is not my design to censure Mr. Madison's course, but I cannot refrain from expressing my regret that his name is not found associated, on that occasion, with the sagacious and firm representatives from the South-Smith, Tucker, and Barber, of South Carolina, James Jackson of Georgia and many others, who at that early period, foresaw the danger and met it, as it ought ever to be met, by those who regard the peace and security of the slave-holding States. Had he added the weight of his talents and authority to theirs, a more healthy tone of sentiment than that which now unfortunately exists, would this day have been the consequence.

Another case has been cited, to justify the vote for reception. I refer to the peti tion from the Quakers, in 1805, which the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Buchanan) relies on to sustain him in receiving the present petition. What I have said in reply to the precedent cited by the Senator from Tennessee, applies equally to this .-Like that the perition prayed legislation, not an abolition of slavery, but the African slave-trade, over which subject Congress

ple called Qunkors, in Pennsylvania, New Jersey. &c. stating that the politioners, from a sense of religious duty had again come forward to plead the cause of their oppressed and degraded fellow men of the African race. On the question! 'Shall this petition be received!' it passed on the africantive—yeas 19, nays 9."

Among those to receive the petition; there were but 4 from the slave-holding States, and this on a single petition praying for legislation on a subject, over which Contrast in so short a time would have full.

in so short a time would have full price. What an example to us on the me occasion. Cart any man doubt, the your if the Southern San loss on the manifest had been placed in the southern but as an array to meet that wreat of relations had been that went of relations to the power of the southern but as the

which is now poured u. Congress, not from peaceable Quakers, but ferocious incendiaries, not to suppress the African slave-trade, but to abolish slavery, they would, with united voice, have rejected the petition with scorn and indignation !-Can any one who knew him doubt that one of the Senators from the South, (the gallant Sumter) who on that occasion voted for receiving the petition, would have been among the first to vindicate the interests of those whom he represented, had the question at that day been what it is on the present occasion? We are next told that, justend of looking to the Constitution, in order to ascertain what are limits to the right of petition, we must push that instru-ment asido, and go back to the Magna Charta and the declaration of rights for its origin and limitation. We live in strange times. It seems there are Christians now more orthodox than the Bible, and politicians whose standard is higher than the Constitution; but I object not to tracing the right to these ancient and venerated sources; I hold in high estimation the institutions of our ancestors. They grew up gradually through many generations, by the incessant and untiring efforts of an intelligent and brave People struggling for centuries against the power of the Crown. To them we are indebted for nearly all that has been gained for liberty in modern times, excepting what we have added. But may I now ask how it has happened that our opponents, in going back to these sacred instruments, have no thought proper to cite their provisions, or to

petitions can violate the right of petition as secured by them? I feel under no obligation to supply the omission-to cite what they have omitted to cite, or to prove from the instruments themselves, that to be no violation of them which they have not proved to be a violation. It is unnecessary. The practice of Parliament is sufficient for my purpose. It proves conclusively that it is no violation of the right, as secured by those instruments, to refuse to receive pett-tions. To establish what this practice is, I ask the Secretary to read from Hatsel, a work of the highest authority, the several paragraphs which are marked with a pencil, commencing at page 700, under the head of Petitions on Matter of supply.

show in what manner our refusal to receive

"On the 9th of April, 1694, a petition was tendered to the House, relating to the bill for granting to their Majestics several duties upon the tonage of ships; and the question being put, that the petition be received, it passed in the negative. "On the 28th of April, 1698, a petition

was offered to the House against the bill for laying a duty upon inland pit coal; and the question being put, that the petition be received, it passed in the negasive. See, also, the 29th and 30th of June, 1698, peti-

"On the 5th of January 1703, a petition of the malsters of Nottingham being offer-ed against the bill for continuing the duties on malt, and the question being put, that the petition be brought up, it passed in the negative. ... On the 21st of December, 1706, Resol-

ved, That this House will receive no petition for any sum of money relating to public service, but what is recommended from the Crown. Upon the 11th of June, 1713, this declared to be a standing order of the House.

"On the 25th of March, 1807, Resolved, That the House will not proceed on any petition, motion, or bill for granting any money, or for releasing or compounding any money owing to the Crown, but in a committee of the whole House; and this is declared to be a standing order. See, also, he 29th Nov. 1710.

a cortificate from the proper officer, anhave been made for the recovery thereof, and what the petitioner and his securify are able

o pay. "Ou the 25th of March, 1715, this is declared to be a standing order. See the 2d of March 1735, and the 9th of January, 1752, the proceedings upon petitions of this sort.

"On the 8th of March, 1732, a petition being offered against a bill depending for securing the trade of the sugar colonies, it was refused to be brought up. A motion was then made that a committee be appointed to search precedents in relation to the receiving or not receiving petitions against the imposing of duties; and the question being put, it passed in the nevative.'

are passed refusing to receive entire classes of petitions, and that too, on the subject of imposing taxes; a subject above all others, in relation to which we would suppose the right ought to be field most sacred, and this right ought to be held most sacred, and this present motion would be out of order; and, within a few years after the declaration of it su is be your opinion, it is your duty, as rights. With these facts before us, what the presiding officer, to call me to order, are we to think of the assertions of the and to arrest all farther discussion on the

precedents for the rejection of petitions.— This body, on a memorable occasion, and after full deliberation, a short time since rejected a petition; and among those will voted for the rejection will be found the names (of course I exclude my own) of the most able-and experienced men of the the nature of a remonstrance, from the eti-zens of York, Pennsylvania, approving the act of the President in removing the deposites. I ask the Secretary to read the in

nals on the occasion : "The Vice President communica preamble and a series of resolutions ed at a meeting of the citizens of county, Pennsylvania, approving the the Executive in removing the pulse upper from the Bank of the United States and opposed to the renewal of the charge of said Bank; which having been read Hr. Clay objected to the reception. And on the question, shall they be received? it was determined in the negative-yels 20,

nays 20. "On motion of Mr. Preston, the and nays being desired by one-fifthof Senators present, those who voted in the affirmative, are,

Messrs. Benton, Brown, Forsyth Grunly, Hendricks, Hill, Kane, King of Ahbama, King of Georgia, Linn, McKean, Mingum, Morris, Robinson, Shepley, Talmadge, Tipton, White, White, Wilkins, Wright. Those who voted in the negativi, are,

"Messrs. Bibb, Black, Calhon, Clay, Clayton, Ewing, Frelinghuysen Kent, Leigh, Moore, Naudain, Poindexte, Porter Prentiss, Preston, Robbins, Silsbe, Smith, Southard, Sprague, Swift, Tomlinsn, Waggaman, Webster."

In citing this case it is not my inention to call in question the consistency of aly memer on this floor; it would be unworthy of the occasion. I doubt not the vote then given was given with a full conviction of its correctness, as it will doubtless be in the present case, on whatever side it may be found. My object is, to show that the principle for which I contend, so far from beingo s sustained by precedents, here ind elsewhere, ancient and modern. In following, as I have, those opposed to

ne, to Magna Charta, and the Delaration of Rights, for the origin and the limits of he right to petition, I am not dispeed, with hem, to set aside the Constitution | I assent to the position they assume, that/the right of petition existed before the Costitution, and that it is not derived from it; but while I look beyond that instrument for the right. I hold the Constitution, on a question as to its extent and limits, to be the lighest au-The first amended article of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall pass no law to prevent the peaceably assembling and pentioning for redress of grievances, was clearly intended to prescribe the limits, within which the ight may be exercised. It is not pretended that to refuse to receive petitions, louches, in the slightest degree, on these limits. To suppose that the framers of the Constitution no, not the framers, but those jealous patriots who were not satisfied with that instrument as it came from the hands of the framers, and who proposed this very provision, to guard what they considered a saered right, performed their task so bunglingv as to omit any essential guard, would be o do great injustice to the memory of those stern and sagacious men; and yet this is the rejection of petitions, because the obli-gation to receive was considered so clear that t was deemed unnecessary; when he ought to have known that, according to the standng practice at that time, Parliament was in constant habit, as has been shown, of refusing to receive petitions—a practice which could not have been unknown to he amendment; and from which it may be fairly inferred that, in omitting to provide that the petitions should be received, it was not intended to comprehend their reception

n the right of petition. I have now, I trust, established, beyond ill controversy, that we are not bound to recive these petitions, and that if we should reject them, we would not, in the slightest legree, infringe the right of petition. It is now time to look to the rights of this body, and to see whether, if we should receive, when it is acknowledged that the only reason for receiving is, that we are bound to do o, we would not establish a principle which would trench deeply on the rights of the Senate. I have already shown that where the action of the Senate commences, there also its right to determine how and when it the 29th Nov. 1710.

"On the 23d of April, 1713, Resolved, shown that the action of the Senare Microsoft Compounding debts to the Crown, upon any branch of the Revenue, without that the Senare cannot proceed to the body: ness without making some disposition of it; and that, by the 24th rule, the first action after presentation is on a question to receive the petition. To extend the right of petition to the question on receiving, is to expunge this rule-to abolish this unquestionable constitutional right of the Senate, and that for the benefit, in this case, of the abolitionists. Their gain would be at the loss of this body. I have not expressed myself too strongly. Give the right of petition the extent contended for ; decide that we are bound, under the Constitution to teceive these incendiary petitions, and the very motion before the Senate would be out of order. If the Constitution makes it our duty to receive, we would have no discretion left to reject, as the motion pre-supposes. Our rules of proceeding must be in accord with the Con-Nothing can be more conclusive. Not stitution. Thus, in the case of received only are petitions rejected, but resolutions bills, which, by the Constitution, must oriare passed refusing to receive entire classes ginate in the other House, it would be out

our eyes for a moment to the nature of the right, which I lear, we are about to shandon, with the view to ascertaln what must be the

or to reject, on which the preservation of their existence depends. Deprive them of this function, and the poisonous, is well as the wholsome, would be indifferently receivof al that is frivolous, absurd, unconstitu tional, immoral, and impious, as well as what may properly demand their deliberation and action. Establish this monstrous, tion and action. Estimusa this involve and unquestionable as that Congress has no this impious principle, (as it would prove and unquestionable as that Congress has no to be, in practice,) and what must be the right to abolish slavery in the States.

The what would we commit Sugar the importance of taking our provention now before consequence? To what would we commit outselves? If a perition should be present-ed praying the abolition of the Constitution, which we are all bound by our oath to proect.) according to this abominable doctrine, t must be received. So, if it was prayed he abolition of the Decalogue, or of the Bible itself. I go further. If the abolition societies should be converted into a body of Atheists, and should ask the passage of a law denying the existence of the Almight Being above us, the Creator of all, accord ing to this blasphemous doctrine, we should be bound to receive the petition, to take ju risdiction of it. I ask the Senators from Tennessee and Pennsylvania (Mr. Grundy and Mr. Buchanan) would they vote to re-ceive such a petition? I wait not an answer They would instantly reject it with loath What then becomes of the unlimited unqualified, and universal obligation to re ceive petitions, which they so strenuously maintained, and to which they are prepared to sacrifice the constitutional rights of thi

I shall now descend from those hypothe tical cases to the particular question before the Senate. What then must be the consequences of receiving this petition, on the principle that we are bound to receive it and all similar petitions whenever presented have continued this question calmly in all its bearings, and do not hesitate to pronounce that to receive, would be to the abolitionists all that the most sanguine could for the present hope, and to abandon all the outworks upon which we of the South rely for our de ence against their attacks here.

No one can believe that the fanatics, who have flooded this and the other House with their patitions, entertain the slightest hope ngress would pass a law at this time to abolish slavery in this District. Infatu ated as they are, they must see that public opinion at the North is not yet prepared for so decisive a step, and that seriously to at-tempt it now would be fatal to their cause. What then do they hope? What but that ongress should take jurisdiction of the subject of abolishing slavery—should throw open to the abolitionists the balls of legislaion, and enable them to establish a permanent position within their walls, from which pereafter to carry on their operations against he institutions of the slave-holding States. If we receive this petition, all these advantages will be realized to them to the fulles Permanent jurisdiction would be only in this District but in the States themselves, whenever the abolitionists might what the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Grundy) has ventured to assert. He said that no provision was added to guard against the rejection of petitions, because the oblichoose to ask Congress by sending their pethem. Having succeeded in this point, a most favorable position would be gained. The centre of operations would be transferred from Nassan Hall to the Halls of Congress. To this common centre, the incenliary publications of the abolitionists would flow, in the form of petitions, to be received and preserved among the public records,-Here the subject of abolition would be agitated session after session, and from hence the assaults on the property and institutions of the people of the slave-holding States would be disseminated, in the guise of speech es, over the whole Union.

Such would be the advantages yielded to the abolitionists. In proportion to their gain would be our loss. What would be yielded o them, would be taken from us. Our true osition, that which is indispensable to our lefence here, is that Congress has no legitimate jurisdiction over the subject of slavery, either here or elsewhere. The reception of this petition surrenders this commanding position; yields the question of jurisdiction, so important to the cause of abolition, and so injurious to us; compels us to sit in silence to witness the assaults on our character and stitutions, or to engage in an idle contest in their defence. Such a contest is beyond apreal endurance. We must in the end be humbled, degraded, broken down, and worn

The Senators from the slave-holding States, who most unfortunately have committed themselves to vote for receiving these incendiary petitions, tell us that whenever the attempt shall be made to abolish slavery, they will join with us to repel it. doubt not the sincerity of their declaration. We all have a common interest, and they cannot betray ours without betraying, at the same time time, their own. But I aunounce them that they are now called on to redeem their pledge. The attempt is now making. The work is going on daily and hourly. The war is waged, not only in the most dangerous manner, but in the only manner it can be waged. Do they expect hat the abolitionists will resort to arms, and commence a crusade to liberate our slaves by force? Is that what they mean when they speak of the attempt to abolish slave-ry? If so, let me tell our friends of the South who differ from us, that the war which the abolitionists wage against us is of a very different character, and far more effective. It is a war of religious and political fanaticism, mingled on the part of the leaders with ambition and the love of notoriety, and

tright, which I lear, we are about to shadon with the view to ascertain what must be the consequence if we surrender it.

Of the rights belonging to a deliberate body. I know of none more universal, or more indispensable to a proper performance of its functions, than the right to determine in its discretion what it shall direct its deliberation and notion. It is the first and universal law of all such as the reports, to bills, and resolutions, varied only in the two latter in the form of the question. It may be compared to the fination in the animal economy, with which all living creatures are endowed, of selecting, through the instinct of taste, what to receive question of the present question, that the present gonds, the enemy of the course in the fination in the animal economy, with which all living creatures are endowed, of selecting of the present question, that the present gonds, the enemy of the fination in the animal economy, with which all living creatures are endowed, of selecting through the instinct of taste, which they bear an animal economy with which all living creatures are endowed, of selecting through the instinct of taste, which they bear animal and that of the guestion of the first, the exterior question, that covers and first, the covers and first, the exterior question, and first, the covers and the first in the end prostrate in the form of the first, the exterior question, and the first institutions; the first institution for the present containing the first institution in the antimated. It is the first in the end of the first intention in the antimated institutions. This is the first intention in the first, the exterior question, that covers and protests all the others. Let it be penetrated. this function, and the poisonous, is well as the wholsome, would be indifferently received into their system. So with deliberand this, Government is concerned. If we can-bodies; deprive them of the essential and not maintain ourselves there, we cannot on what to receive or reject, and they would, that can be raised, there is not one on which of al that is frivolous. There's a result, we can rally on arrived to the passive receptacle, indifferently, we can rally on arrived to the raised. ourselves, or more untenable for our oppo nents, not excepting the ultimate question of abolition in the States. For our right to reject this petition is a truth as clear

Such as the importance of taking our stand pamovably on the question now before us. Such are the advantages that we of the South would sacrifice, and the abolitionists would gain, were we to surrender that important position by receiving this petition. a sacrifice? What advant: ges can we hope to gain that would justify us?

We are told of the great advantage of a trong majority. I acknowledge it in a cause, and on sound principles. I feel in the present instance how much our cause would be strengthened by a strong and decided majority for the rejection of these incendiary petitions. If any thing we could do here could arrest the progress of the abolitionists, it would be such a rejection. But as advantageous as would be a strong majority on sound principles, it is in the same degree dangerous, when on the opposite-when it rests on improper conessions, and the surrender of principles, which would be the case at present. Such majority must in this instauce be purhased by concessions to the abolitionists, and a surrender, on our part, that would lemolish all our outworks, give up all our strong positions, and open all the passes to the free admission of our enemies. It is only on this condition that we can hope to obtain such a majority—a majority which must be gathered together from all sides, and entertaining every variety of opinion. To rally such a majority, the Scuator from Pennsylvania has fallen on the device to eccive this petition, and immediately reect it, without consideration or reflection To my mind the movement looks like a a mere piece of artifice to juggle and deceive. I intend no disrespect to the Senator. I doubt not his intentions are good, and believe his feelings are with us but I must say that the course he has intimated is, in my opinion, the worst possible for the slaveholding States. It surrenders all to the dentificants and the least advantage turn, that would be of the least advantage to us. Let the majority for the course he

tope that it will make any impression on the abolitionists? Can he even hope of obtaining his position of rejecting their petitions without consideration, against hem ! Does he not see that, in assuming purisdiction by receiving their petitions, he gives an implied pledge to enquire, to deliberate, and decide on them? Experience will teach him that we must either refuse to receive, or go through. I entirely co cur with the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Prentiss, on that point. There is no middle ground that is tenable, and, least of all, that oposed to be occupied by the Senator rom Pennsylvania, and those who act with him. In the mean time, the course he proposes is calculated to full the people of the daveholding States into a false security, under the delusive impression which it is calculated to make, that there is more uni-versal strength here against the abolitionists than real does exist. But we are told that the right of petition

indicates be ever so strong, can the Senator

popular in the North, and that to make in issue, however true, which might bring t in question, would weaken our friends and strengthen the abolitionists. I have no loubt of the kind feelings of our brethren from the North, on this floor; but I clearly see that, while we have their feelings in our favor, their constituents, right or wrong, will have their votes, however we may be effected. But I assure our friends that we would not do any thing, willingly, which yould weaken them at home; and, if we ould be assured that, by yielding to their wishes the right of receiving petitions, they would be able to arrest, permanently, the progress of the abolitionists, we might then e induced to yield; but nothing short of the certainty of permanent security can inour rights must increase the abolitionists, be it so. I would at no period make the least sacrifice of principle for any temporay advantage, and much less at the present. If there must be an issue, now is our time. We never can be more united or better prepared for the struggle; and I, for one would much rather meet the danger now, than to turn it over to those who are to come after us.

But putting these views aside, it does eem to inc, taking a general view of the subject, that the course intimated by the Senator from Pennsylvania is radically wrong, and must end in disappointment The attempt to unite all, must, as it usually loes, terminate in division and distraction. It will divide the South on the question of receiving, and the North on that of rejecion, with a mutual weakening of both. I dready see indications of division among Yorthern gentlemen on this floor, even in this stage of the question. A division a-mong them would give a great impulse to the cause of abolition. Whatever position the parties may take, in the event of such livision, one or the other would be considerd more or less favorable to the abolition cause, which could not fail to run it into

is to keep the two great parties if ere mite against them, which would be in possible in they divide here. The gourse intimates roll owits purbid waves of folly and fanati-cism, it must in the end prostrate in the North all the institutions that uphold their peace and prosperity, and ultimately overwhelm all that is eminent, morally and inellectually. I have now concluded what I intended

to say on the question immediately before the Senate. If I have spoken carnestly, t is because I feel the subject to be one of the deepest interest. We are about to take the first step; that must control all our sub-sequent movements. If it should be such, as I fear it will, if we receive this petition, and establish the principle that we are obliged to receive all such peritions; if we shall determine to take permanent jurisdicion over the subject of abolition, whenever and in whatever manner the abolitionsts may ask, either here or in the States, I fear that the consequence will be ultimatey disastrous. Such a course would destroy the confidence of the People of the slave holding States in this Government. We ove and cherish the Union; we remember with the kindest feelings our common origin, with pride our common achievements, and fondly anticipate the common greatness and glory that seem to await us ; but origin, achievements, and anticipation of comit greatness are to us nothing, compared to this question. It is to us a vital question. It involves, not only our liberty, but, what is greater, (if to freemen any thing can be,) existence itself. The relation which now exists between the two races in the slaveholding States has existed for two centuries. It has grown with our growth, and strengthened with our strength. It has entered into and modified all our institutions, civil and political. None other can be substituted. We will not, cannot permit it to be destroyed. If we were base enough to do so, we would be traitors to our section, to ourselves, our families, and to posterity. It is our anxious desire to protect and preserve this relation by the joint action of the Government and the confederated States of the Union; but if, instead of closing the door; if, instead of denying all jurisdiction and all interference in this question, the doors of Congress are to be thrown open and if we are to be exposed here, in heart of the Union, to an endless attack on our rights, our character, and our institutions; if the other States are to stand and look on without attempting to suppress these attacks, originating within their borders; and, finally, if this is to be our fixed and permanent condition, as members of this Confederacy, we will then be compelled to turn our eyes on ourselves. Como schut will, should it cost group then blood, and every cent of property, we must defend ourselves; and, if compelled, we would stand justified by all laws, human and divine.

If I feel alarm, it is not for ourselves, but for the Union and the institutions of the country, to which I have been devotedly attached however calumniated and slandered. Few have made greater sacrifices to maintain them, and none is more anxious to perpetuate them to the latest generation; but they can and ought to be perpetuated only on the condition that they fulfil the great object for which they were created-the liberty and protection of these States.

As for ourselves, I feel no apprehension I know to the fullest extent the magnitude of the danger that surrounds us. I am not disposed to underestimate it. My colleague has painted it truly. But, as great as the danger, we have nothing to fear if true to ourselves. We have many and great resources; a numerous, intelligent and brave population; great and valuable staples; ample fiscal means; unity of feelings and interest, and an entire exemption from those dangers originating in conflict between labor and capital, which at this time threatens so much danger to constitutional Governments. To these may be added that we would act under an imperious necessity. There would be to us but one altenative-to triumph or perish as a people. We would stand alone, compelled to defend life, character, and institutions. A necessity so stern and imperious would develope to the full, all the great qualities of our nature, mental and moral, requisite for defence-intelligence, fortitude. courage, and patriotism; and these, with our ample means, and our admirable materials for the construction of durable free States, would

insure security liberty and renown.

With these impressions, I ask neither sympathy nor compassion for the slaveholding States. We can take care of ourselves. It is not we, but the Union which is in danger. It is that which demands our care—demands that the agitation of the question cease here that you shall refuse to receive these petitions, and decline all jurisdiction over the ject of abolition, in every form and shape. It is only on these terms that the Union can We cannot remain here in an endless struggleån defence of our character, our property, and institutions.

I shall in conclusion, make a few remarks ns to the course I shall feel my self compelled to pursue should the Senate, by receiving this petition, determine to entertain jurisdiction over the question of abolition. Thinking as I do, I can perform no act that would countenance so dangerous an assumption; and, as a participation in the subs quent proceedings on this petition, should it unfortunately be received, might be so construed, in that event I shall feel myself constrained to decline such participation, and to leave the responsibility wholly on those who may assume it.

The Surplus Revenue has increased, is increasing and assist be diminished. The amount of public moneys in the Deposite Banks by the return to (or nearest to) the 1st the political struggles of the two great parties of the North. With these views I hold that the only possible hope of arresting the Dollars !—Nat. Intelligence.